

DOCUMENT RESUME

03342 - [A2433571]

[Protest Alleging Specification Deficiencies]. B-189948. August 30, 1977. 1 pp.

Decision re: Arctic Engineers and Constructors; Global Marine Development Inc.; Global Marine, Inc., by Milton Socolar (for Paul G. Dembling, General Counsel).

Issue Area: Federal Procurement of Goods and Services (1500).
Contact: Office of the General Counsel: Procurement Law II.
Budget Function: General Government: Other General Government (806).

Organization Concerned: Coast Guard.
Authority: 4 C.F.R. 20.2(b)(1).

The protesters objected to the proposed award of a contract, alleging that the specifications in the request for proposals were too restrictive in one area, failed to provide data or requirements for other areas believed to be important, and were otherwise defective. The protest, which was filed after the closing date for receipt of initial proposals, was untimely and not for consideration. (Author/SC)

3571
03342

DECISION



**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES**
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FILE: B-189948

DATE: August 30, 1977

MATTER OF: Arctic Engineers and Constructors/Global Marine
Development Inc./Global Marine, Inc.

DIGEST:

Protest alleging specification deficiencies which is filed after closing date for receipt of initial proposals is untimely and not for consideration under GAO Bid Protest Procedures.

Arctic Engineers and Constructors/Global Marine Development Inc./Global Marine, Inc. (Arctic) protest the proposed award of a contract under request for proposals (RFP) No. CG-74401-A, by the United States Coast Guard for a non-self-propelled air cushion icebreaker.

Arctic asserts that the specifications are too restrictive in one area, fail to provide data or requirements for other areas believed to be important, and are otherwise defective.

These allegations relate to deficiencies in the RFP. Section 20.2(b)(1) of our Bid Protest Procedures, 4 C.F.R. 20.2 (b)(1) (1977), provides that a protest based upon an alleged impropriety in any type of solicitation, which is apparent prior to bid opening or the closing date for receipt of initial proposals, must be filed "prior to bid opening or the closing date for receipt of initial proposals." Arctic did not protest these alleged deficiencies prior to the closing date for receipt of proposals but only after it had submitted its proposal and that proposal had been rejected. Accordingly, the protest is untimely and not for consideration under our Bid Protest Procedures.

for
Paul G. Dembling
General Counsel